

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 KEYA MORGAN,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
15 DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,  
16 LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S  
17 DEPARTMENT, JEFFREY C. STODEL,  
18 JR., an individual, LOS ANGELES CITY  
19 POLICE DEPARTMENT, JACKIE  
20 LACEY, an individual, GABRIEL F.  
21 MUNOZ, an individual, JOAN CELIA  
22 "JC" LEE, as an individual and as  
23 Successor in Interest to the STAN LEE  
24 TRUST, KIRK SCHENK, an individual,  
25 and DOES 1–100,

26 Defendants.  
27  
28

Case No. 2:23-cv-10474-MRA-MAR

**JUDGMENT FOLLOWING ORDER  
GRANTING DEFENDANTS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, JACKIE  
LACEY, AND JEFFREY C. STODEL,  
JR.'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

1 On March 6, 2025, the Court granted Defendants County of Los Angeles District  
2 Attorney's Office, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Jackie Lacey, and Jeffrey  
3 C. Stodel, Jr.'s ("County Defendants") Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of  
4 Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and entered an Order dismissing Plaintiff Key Morgan's First  
5 Amended Complaint against County Defendants with prejudice. ECF 100. County  
6 Defendants thereafter requested the entry of Judgment in their favor and against  
7 Plaintiff pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(d). ECF 114. Plaintiff's claims  
8 against Defendants Joan Celia Lee and Kirk Schenk remain pending. *See* ECF 103.

9 Ordinarily, the Court's ability to issue a judgment is constrained by the "one final  
10 judgment" rule. *See Romoland Sch. Dist. v. Inland Empire Energy Ctr., LLC*, 548 F.3d  
11 738, 747 (9th Cir. 2008). However, when an action involves multiple parties or claims,  
12 district courts have discretion to "direct entry of a final judgment as to one or more, but  
13 fewer than all, claims or parties only if the court expressly determines that there is no  
14 just reason for delay." Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *see Noel v. Hall*, 568 F.3d 743, 747 (9th  
15 Cir. 2009). Accordingly, the Court makes the following findings:

16 1. The judgment at issue is a "final judgment." *Curtiss-Wright Corp. v.*  
17 *General Elec. Co.*, 446 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1980).

18 2. There is no "just reason for delay." Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b);  
19 *AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist W., Inc.*, 465 F.3d 946, 954 (9th Cir. 2006).

20 3. Because there is minimal "interrelationship of claims," the Court finds that  
21 the judgment at issue will not lead to "piecemeal appeals." *S.E.C. v. Platforms Wireless*  
22 *Int'l Corp.*, 617 F.3d 1072, 1084 (9th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted).

23 4. The equities, including "efficient judicial administration," prejudice, and  
24 delay, warrant a separate judgment. *Id.*

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(b) and 58(a), the Court hereby  
2 enters judgment in favor of the County Defendants and against Plaintiff.

3  
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: April 18, 2025

  
HON. MÓNICA RAMÍREZ ALMADANI  
United States District Court Judge